

6967. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Socrates Moscahlades and Styliamos Moscahlades (Moscahlades Brothers). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 9475. I. S. No. 1224-p.)

On March 12, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Socrates Moscahlades and Styliamos Moscahlades, copartners, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about October 1, 1917, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Gloria Virgin Pure Olive Oil," which was misbranded.

Examination of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the average net contents of 12 cans to be 0.957 gallon, and the average shortage in volume to be 4.30 per cent.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "1 Gall.," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it, was false and misleading in that it represented that said cans contained not less than 1 gallon of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that said cans contained not less than 1 gallon of the article, whereas, in truth and fact, they contained less than 1 gallon of the article. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On March 26, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6968. Misbranding of cottonseed feed and adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. Atlanta Cotton Oil Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 9476. I. S. Nos. 2898-p, 3553-p, 6809-p.)

On April 29, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Atlanta Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Atlanta, Ga., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Georgia into the State of North Carolina, on or about March 3, 1918, and March 19, 1918, of quantities of cottonseed feed which was misbranded, and on or about February 28, 1918, of a quantity of cottonseed meal which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the percentage of protein in the shipment of March 3, 1918, to be 33.1, and in the shipment of March 19, 1918, to be 35.3. The percentage of ammonia in the cottonseed meal was 6.83, and at least 24 per cent of cottonseed hulls was present.

Misbranding of the cottonseed feed was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein (minimum) 36.00%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not less than 36 per cent of protein, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 36 per cent of protein, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained

less than 36 per cent of protein, to wit, approximately 33.1 or 35.3 per cent of protein, as the case might be.

Adulteration of the cottonseed meal was alleged for the reason that cottonseed hulls had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for "Good 7% Cottonseed Meal," to wit, 7 per cent ammonia cottonseed meal, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was a product composed in part of cottonseed hulls which contained less than 7 per cent of ammonia, prepared in imitation of "Good 7% Cottonseed Meal," and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, "Good 7% Cottonseed Meal." Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On September 11, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6969. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Socrates Moscahlades and Styliamos Moscahlades, copartners (Moscahlades Brothers). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 9477. I. S. No. 2665-p.)

On March 12, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Socrates Moscahlades and Styliamos Moscahlades, copartners, trading as Moscahlades Brothers, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about November 12, 1917, from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Gloria Virgin Pure Olive Oil," which was misbranded.

Examination of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the average net contents of 3 cans to be 1 pint 14.77 fluid ounces.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, " $\frac{1}{4}$ Gall.," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it, was false and misleading in that it represented that said cans contained not less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that said cans contained not less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon of the article, whereas, in fact and in truth, said cans did contain less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon of the article. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On March 26, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6970. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Nicholas S. Monahos. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75. (F. & D. No. 9479. I. S. No. 1357-p.)

On March 5, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Nicholas S. Monahos, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 12, 1918, from the State